

# Times-Dispatch

**DAILY-WEEKLY-SUNDAY.**  
 Business Office.....10 E. Main Street.  
 Washington Bureau.....1014 14th St. N. W.  
 New York Bureau.....130 Broadway  
 St. Louis Bureau.....100 N. 3rd St.  
 Chicago Bureau.....100 N. Dearborn St.  
 By Mail: One Year, \$10.00; Six Months, \$6.00; Three Months, \$3.50.  
 Single Copies, 10 Cents.  
 Daily, without Sunday, 10 Cents.  
 Sunday edition only, 10 Cents.  
 (Weekly Subscriptions Payable in Advance.)

Entered January 27, 1906, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter, under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

SUNDAY, JUNE 17, 1906.

## How to Call The Times-Dispatch.

Persons wishing to communicate with The Times-Dispatch by telephone will ask call "4041," and on being answered from the office switchboard will indicate the department or person with whom they wish to speak.

## Increasing Paternalism.

When the first revelations of the manners and customs of the packers were made, The Times-Dispatch joined in the demand for enforced improvement. In the first comment this paper made on that subject, the attention of the public was called to the important and essential part played by local self-government in preventing and curing such conditions as those described by Messrs. Neill and Reynolds. Further consideration has only confirmed this opinion and strengthened this paper's belief that a horde of Federal inspectors is an unnecessary, unwieldy and revolutionary price to pay even for wholesome canned foods.

Throughout this discussion, it must ever be borne in mind that the fresh beef, mutton and lamb, which constitute ninety per cent. of the entire meat business, is admittedly pure, clean and fit for human use. To condemn all forms of meat, therefore, in one indiscriminate and fearful arraignment is to work wicked and worse than useless damage to innocent and defenseless cattle-raisers and killers of beef.

With this thought in view, and with the desire and intention to absolutely rectify the conditions reported to the President, the question of means and methods still remains. The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot holds that it is illogical for this paper to desire the strengthening of the Federal control over the railroads, and "gag at Federal inspection of meats which are to enter interstate commerce." This doubt may be allayed if the Virginian-Pilot will inform itself of the salient and almost unescapable fact that the United States courts have decided that Federal control over railroads doing an interstate business was constitutional, while the statutes requiring Federal inspection of the packing-houses have by the same tribunals been declared unconstitutional. The sole reason why the packers have not refused to allow Federal inspection is because they want the stamp of government approval—that is all, and, from every instinct of justice and fairness, such reputation as is possible should be made, and such guarantees as are trustworthy should be given, in order that the innocent may not perish with the guilty.

But even this merciful thought should be tempered with the reflection that if the Federal government is to inspect and practically control the preparation of all canned and fresh meats, because, in the words of the Virginian-Pilot, "they are to enter interstate commerce," then, by the same reasoning, the Federal government should appoint other bureaus and other armies of inspectors to supervise the manufacture of shoes, cotton cloth, tobacco, pig-iron and practically every product except those breakfast breads of old Virginia or buckwheat cakes of New England, which must be eaten hot.

If the Virginian-Pilot believes that extension of Federal control over the lives and works of individuals is wise and helpful, apart from all political antecedents of Democracy or Republicanism, then our Norfolk contemporary does well to urge insistently the enactment of such legislation.

The Times-Dispatch desires pure food also, but in this hysterical rush for extra constitutional remedies the tendency must not be overlooked that to follow this course means to supplant individuality in initiative and character by a centralized governmental control.

## Our Dictator.

The evidence accumulates that President Roosevelt regards himself as the supreme ruler of the United States. He has undertaken to browbeat Congress, and he has come precious near under-taking to browbeat the courts. In yesterday's paper it was recorded that if Congress should send a measure to the President providing for the construction of a sea-level canal on the Isthmus of Panama, he would veto it. One of the President's friends introduced an amendment to the item in the sundry civil bill appropriating \$25,000,000 to continue the construction of the Panama Canal, provided that no part of that sum should be used in the construction of a sea-level canal. This was done with the approval of the President, and doubtless at his instigation.

The President has also given the House Committee on Agriculture to understand that no measure relating to government inspection of the packing-houses will be allowed to become a law, except it be in entire accordance with his own views. The President has the right of veto, but it is a usurpation for him to use that power in advance as a big stick with which to beat the legislative branch into submission to his commands. The veto power is not by any fair construction of the Constitution to be used as a threat and a means of intimidation.

President Roosevelt has assumed the attitude of a dictator. He believes in government regulation and control of railroads, coal mines, packing-houses and various other enterprises carried on by private corporations, and he assumes to dictate to the legislative department the quality of legislation to be enacted in this direction. President Roosevelt is honest and conscientious, but that is characteristic of all fanatics, and Mr. Roosevelt's craze for government control has wellnigh reached the stage of fanaticism. It is time for the people to call a halt on him.

## Danville's Progress.

A little while back McClure's Magazine published a "purpose article." The matter of the article related to the city of Danville, Virginia, and its purpose was to show that the growth of Danville was greatly retarded by railroad discrimination. As in all such cases, the writer went to extremes and in his zeal to make out a case against the railroads did Danville a grave injustice in representing it as a city of vacant stores and unoccupied factories.

The Times-Dispatch knew enough of the situation in Danville to feel sure that this article was grossly misleading, and in order to present the bright side of the picture and to undo, as far as possible, the mischief which the McClure article has wrought, sent to Danville a staff correspondent, whose long residence in that city made him entirely familiar with the situation, with instructions to make a full investigation and report the results. This article will be found in the industrial section of The Times-Dispatch to-day, and will show, as was a foregone conclusion, that, in spite of any disadvantage in railroad rates, in spite of the revolution in the tobacco business, Danville has been making steady progress from year to year, and is to-day one of the most prosperous and progressive cities in the State.

The tobacco industry of Danville has undergone a great change in the past ten years, necessitating a readjustment of the city's industrial system. But the live men of Danville have met the situation with intelligence and courage and turned it to good account.

The Register, Danville's representative newspaper, says that during the past ten years Danville has started in the manufacture of cotton goods, 45,000 spindles, 1,000 looms, and put to work 975 operatives. By July 1st of this year this new plant will be exactly double, making a total of 90,000 spindles, 2,000 looms and 1,950 operatives, to which is to be added 2,000 spindles, 2,000 looms and 1,650 operatives in operation prior to this period, making a grand total of 100,000 spindles, 5,000 looms and 3,600 operatives, with an annual pay-roll of \$200,000 and doing a business of \$4,500,000 a year. During this period Danville men have put to work 1,000 operatives in the manufacture of pants, coats, shirts and overalls, putting out from 25,000 to 30,000 dozens per year, employing 150 operatives and does a business of \$100,000 annually. During this period Danville men have started a building factory, which employs 100 operatives and puts out 15,000 dozens of its product annually, and we are informed by the presidents of these respective enterprises that the capacity of both will be practically doubled in the immediate future.

During this period Danville men have built and equipped a furniture factory, which employs 30 skilled men, puts out 10,000 finished pieces, and does a business of \$135,000 per annum.

In spite of any disadvantage of freight rates, Danville has a number of wholesale grocery houses, which are all doing a thriving business, the banks and retail stores are all prosperous, and there is steady employment for all persons who are willing to work. All this in addition to the great tobacco industry, which is still the backbone of the city's wealth and prosperity.

There is something else to Danville's credit which is even more to be desired than material prosperity. Its policies are absolutely clean, and its municipal government has never been tainted with graft or any form of corruption.

## Mr. Adams and the Race Problem.

Mr. Charles Francis Adams, of Massachusetts, whose recent article in the Century Magazine on the negro problem was so extensively read and criticized, has written a letter on the same subject to Professor Kelly Miller, of Howard University, Washington, which The Times-Dispatch is permitted to publish. Mr. Adams says that in his paper in the Century he did not set forth so clearly as he might have done the difficulty in the way of the solution of the race problem as it rests in his mind, and in this letter has endeavored to make good the deficiency. He holds that the race problem can only be successfully approached in a peculiarly scientific spirit; that philanthropy has nothing to do with it; that the feeling of common humanity has nothing to do with it; that the patronizing spirit which would raise an oppressed race has nothing to do with it. On the contrary, it requires, as matter of fact, cold scientific, historical investigation, and in that way only is he disposed to discuss it.

Proceeding with the argument, Mr. Adams says that the whole principle of American civilization and polity has hitherto depended on one theory—the belief that infusions of foreign blood could be assimilated by the American community and finally absorbed into it. But we have been able neither to assimilate nor absorb either the negro or the Indian.

The reason is manifest. The Anglo-Saxon race, whether in America or elsewhere, has shown a genius for enriching its blood with blood of other races. In America we have taken liberal infusions of foreign blood, and usually to the advantage of our own race, but the blood thus infused has been the blood of whites. The line is drawn at the black race. Otherwise, the white race would be destroyed. As Mr. Adams mildly puts it, if we should undertake to absorb the black race by what is known as miscegenation, the result would be a bastard and mongrel race, and the process would be in its result good neither for the white nor the black. He adds that in Jamaica the black has absorbed the white, and the result is not encouraging. We should say not.

He casts aside the question of absorption as being impossible, and then asks whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman

whether or not ten million blacks can be assimilated without being absorbed—that is, practically made the same as the whites with no race conflict. The alternative, says he, is to throw the black race off. Neither, he thinks, is practicable. He concludes, "If we cannot assimilate, if we cannot throw off, if we cannot do either, we are left with a problem that is as old as the hills, and as new as the day."

Under these circumstances, if we cannot assimilate—if to absorb is undesirable, and, in my opinion, an inhuman